

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Fig. 1 has been amended to include the reference number for the control unit (34). A replacement sheet for Fig. 1 reflecting this change is attached.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are requested. By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 14 and claim 14 has been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-7, 10-13, 16 and 18-24 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections, which are discussed below.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified on the claims. Specifically, none of the figures included a reference number for the control unit (34). Replacement Fig. 1 includes reference number 34, which indicates the control unit. This reference number had been inadvertently omitted. No new matter is added by replacement Fig. 1.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10-13 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 6-303907 to Tanizawa. Claims 3-4 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tanizawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,029,446 to Suzuki. Claims 14, 16 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tanizawa in view of Suzuki and U.S. Patent No. 5,101,714 to Grandi.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 14 which has been cancelled by the above amendment. Claim 1 now requires that “said mould (14) has electrical contact elements (28) which emerge on the outer surface of the mould (14) itself for the electrical supply of said at least one thermal-conditioning unit (24) and said electrical contact elements (28) have a slider conformation, so as to enable the electrical supply of said at least one conditioning unit (24) during movement of said mould (14) along a path of movement.” None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a mould with electrical contact elements having a slider conformation as required by amended claim 1. In rejecting claim 14, the Office Action cites to Grandi as teaching “the use of a slider (conveyor 45, Fig. 5) for the purpose of moving mold (19, the Examiner considering the box 19 as a mold holding products with another male mold as taught by Suzuki) in a refrigeration unit to cool the product.”

The conveyor 45 of Grandi is a standard roller belt. (Grandi, Col. 4, Line 65). The boxes 19 are described as a “gastronomic bins or baskets.” (Grandi, Col. 4, Lines 56-57). Figs. 4, 7 and 8 of Grandi, show the flat-bottomed boxes 19 as resting on the flat surface of the roller belt 45. The boxes of Grandi 19, which the Office Action considers to be the mould of claim 1, clearly do not have an electrical contact having a slider conformation as required by amended claim 1. Given that the boxes shown in Grandi are simple containers, without any requirements for an electrical supply, there would be no reason for an electrical contact between the roller belt and the box. Tanizawa and Suzuki also fail to disclose or suggest a mould with an electrical contact having a slider conformation as required by amended claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to require the limitations of claim 14 which was rejected as obvious over Tanizawa in view of Suzuki and Grandi. As discussed above, Tanizawa in view of Suzuki and Grandi fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of amended claim 1 which is therefore allowable.

Accordingly, Tanizawa in view of Suzuki and Grandi fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of amended claim 1 which is therefore allowable. Claims 2-7, 10-13, 16 and 18-24 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and should be allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claims 2, 5-7, 10-13 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanizawa. These claims depend from claim 1, which now includes the limitation of claim 14, rendering the rejection of these claims as anticipated by Tanizawa moot.

Claims 3-4 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tanizawa in view of Suzuki. These claims depend from claim 1, which now includes the limitation of claim 14, rendering the rejection of these claims as obvious over Tanizawa in view of Suzuki moot.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ryan P. Wallace". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Ryan P. Wallace
Registration No, 60,212
Attorneys for Applicant
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK
1425 K Street N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 783-6040